

The Wright Path to 2025
Mini-Summit 1 – Establishing Working Groups
Part One – Review and Reaction to Stakeholder Summit Work
May 18, 2018 Summary

On May 18, 2018, 90 attendees representing a cross-section of Wright State University faculty, staff, students and community members gathered at 2455 Presidential Drive for the first of six mini-summits. The focus of part one of the summit was for each strategic initiative group to review the documentation developed at the Stakeholder Summit in March 2018. The review focused on the aspiration statement and specific questions to answer to begin developing a plan around the strategic initiative. Each group then shared their insights with all the participants.

Initial discussion was provided by president Schrader and David bright. Schrader provided a recount of the process to date. David provided a presentation showing the next steps for the summer and the responsibilities of each working group in creating specific items for the strategic plan.

90 people attended the first summit.

Alumni/Advancement

Rewrote the initial aspiration statement, as they thought it should include specific goals and Wright State pride. What is known? What is engagement? What is the brand? How to build pack mentality? All constituencies need to be involved.

- Questions?
 - What is known? Engagement?
 - What is the Wright State brand?
 - How do we develop around the brand?
 - How do we develop pride around the brand?
 - How to address negative experiences?
 - How to obtain and grown philanthropic support to advance Wright State mission
 - The key questions 1-3 on the stakeholder summit work on alumni

- Involvement
 - Admissions
 - Donors
 - Alumni leaders
 - Faculty
 - Academic leadership
 - Athletics
 - Public relations
 - External corporate leaders
 - Student orgs
 - K-12
 - Partner institutions
 - We are ALL advancement

- Reaction to Aspiration Statement
 - Students, Alumni & community passionate about wright state experience
 - Not adequate
 - Should include goals
 - “Raider” should not be included -> rephrase to Wright State pride instead
 - Revised draft
 - Wright State will be known and admired as a high-value and impactful university. Our alumni, students, and community members are passionate about their Wright State experience and mission. We will support the mission through renewed and stronger transformational gifts and advocacy.

- Coordinators
 - Melissa Tan, Amy Jones, Bill Shockley, Greg Scharer, and Monica Snow

Community/Diversity/Globalization

The group felt the statement is not sufficient. Initiative with community is not on there. We need to include the community; we can't be isolated. Additional perspectives needed: senior admin, student, staff, and faculty.

Reactions to aspiration statement

- Terms should be defined in the statement
- How will the statement be measured?
- Include more information in statement
- Sentence structure
- Statement says nothing about community & globalization
- Diversity should be infused in everything & centered

Key Questions

- How are we defining terms?
- How are we including international students?
- How do we distinguish/infuse ourselves from/with the other groups?
- How are we measuring this?
- Who should be held accountable for achieving the statement?
- What resources are available/needed to accomplish this?
- Why aren't more people here?

Significant insight into aspiration statement

- The statement is not sufficient enough & the initiative is not fine-tuned.

Who needs to be involved?

- All stakeholders
 - Community members/organizations
 - Senior administration
 - Provost

- President
- VPs
- Deans
- Students
- Staff
- Faculty

Coordinators

Nicole Carter

Community Partnerships

There's a tension between the idea of centralized oversight versus a decentralized system that empowers people to build partnerships. Protocols need to be created to empower people rather than create an office. Additional perspectives needed: internship management, enrollment management, advancement, research, identity groups, legal. How to get from "hey, let's form a partnership" to scaling up.

New draft aspiration statement

- Wright State University is viewed as a valuable partner for our greater community. Wright State University looks to the community as a source of sustainable partnerships, opportunities, and growth.
 - Communication
 - Protocols to develop
 - Empowerment of individuals
 - Processes to scale up more formal partnerships

Stakeholders

- Career center
- Community service providers/organizations
- Strategic enrollment management
- Foundation/advancement
- Research & sponsored programs
- Student affairs
- Legal/compliance
- Faculty/academic partners
- Community partners
 - Arts
 - Military
 - Corporate
 - Community colleges
 - Philanthropic
 - Non-profit
 - Government
 - Healthcare
 - Museums

For partnerships, how do we create the good deal for?

- Wright State
- The individual
- The partnership
 - Tension between centralization and decentralization
 - Office/committee of community partnership & engagement
 - To support and coordinate
- Is this the specific work of the units and colleges?

Coordinators – Seth Gordon and Mary Jean Henry

Curriculum Collaboration

Rewrote the statement to focus on revising the curricular process so that programs remain relevant to community and that success is independent of student preparation. Need more faculty, Carl Brun specifically mentioned.

New aspiration statement

- Revise curricular processes to ensure programs remain relevant to students and employers by providing clear pathways to timely completion of degree independent of student preparation

Stakeholders

- Include more faculty, others from student success, Carl Brun, CTL, outside university to ensure career relevancy

Coordinators

- Carol Loranger, Brian Rigling

Digital Transfer of Services

Aspiration statement needs to include impact and process improvement. This may need some scope around it, as well as consistency and prioritization. Additional perspectives needed: faculty, students, and administrative assistants.

Reaction to aspiration statement

- Would love to see us get there (seamless digital experience)
- Who is not here that should be?
- What systems do we have? Do we have duplication?
- Lacking “impact” statement
- Need consistency
- Lean/process improvement

- Who is the authority and enforcement of technology decisions?
- How do we limit shadow technology?
- Funding and resources

Key Questions

- Single “authority” processes exist
 - Communications & marketing
 - Print
- How do we engage all stakeholders in decisions?
 - Students
- How do we identify processes that need “digitized?”
- Better communication
 - How to better communicate changes, decisions, etc.

Who needs to be involved? (how do we identify these groups?)

- All stakeholders (faculty, staff, students)
- Non-IT people (group was all IT)
- Admin assistants (engage all end users)
- Usability (surveys, one on one, focus groups)

Coordinators – Jonathan Jackson, Lee McKarns

Key Insight -> need scope, consistency and prioritization (increase revenue & decrease expense)

Experiential Learning

Changed statement to be more active: every WSU student *will* participate in experiential learning. Discussed what is experiential learning – immersive, active, applied learning that connects to students’ personal goals. Trying to understand what is going right at the university currently and how can we build on that. Additional perspectives needed: employers, internship providers.

New aspiration statement

- Every Wright State student will participate in an immersive, active, applied, reflective learning experience that connects with a student’s career, academic, and/or personal goals.
 - Meaningful means student aspirations and is career relatable

Key questions

- Need to define experiential education
- Understanding what we are already have or doing across campus and assess the program’s effectiveness

Coordinators Wayne Stark, Melissa Guffey, Lance Cauley

Faculty/Staff Development

Discussion focused on development being a continuous process, not just an event. It needs to be ongoing. Additional perspectives needed: men, faculty, supervisors, upper admin. Resources needed.

Key questions

- What types of development activities will support our/your success?
- How do we provide advancement opportunities for faculty and staff?
- What resources are needed to support this initiative?
- What upper administration support is necessary to support this initiative?
- How do we gain a better understanding of what staff/faculty do?
- How can professional participation be recognized and rewarded?

Key Insight

Onboarding and training/development is a process and not an event.

Stakeholders to involve

- Upper administration
- Staff representatives
- Faculty representatives
- HR
- IT
- Marketing/communications
- Supervisory positions

Coordinators

Linda Hockaday and Shannon Norton

Globalization & International Outreach

WSU will provide global, cross-cultural learning opportunities. "Global citizen" left out because it's an ambiguous concept. Need to focus on student mobility, both study abroad and international students. Additional perspectives needed: admin, staffing, curriculum development. Need to identify resources and administrative bottlenecks and check for curriculum integration. Also need to look into experiential learning opportunities abroad.

Aspiration statement

- Wright State University will transform domestic and international students, faculty, and staff by providing global, cross-cultural, immersive experiences, preparing our students as citizens and professionals.

Priorities

- Student mobility
 - Outgoing (education abroad)
 - Incoming (international recruiting)
- Administrative structure and staffing

- Curriculum, co-curricular
 - Study abroad should not impact time to graduation

Next steps

- Identify current financial resources
- Identify policy & procedural bottleneck
- Assess current level of curriculum integration
- Examine and establish affordable partnerships abroad
- Examine experiential opportunities

Coordinators Bill Holmes

Inter-Unit Collaboration

Doing better business will bring about better communication. Better communication is an outcome of better business. We need to streamline business processes and improve stewardship as part of this better business. No coordinators identified. Need more faculty, staff, etc.

The group modified the existing aspiration statement as it was only bullet points and not entirely relevant to the overall issue. New aspirational goals of the topic follow

- Doing better business will lead to a byproduct of better communication
- Identify duplicative services and resources, both academic and non-academic
- Combine duplicative services and resources to create efficiencies
- Define new business processes and standardize across units

Coordinator Amy Barnhart

Online Courses

Need investment into infrastructure in online courses. Faculty development/training, student services, etc. Most of the growth so far in this area has been organic. To improve from this point investment from the top is needed. Additional perspectives needed: enrollment management, faculty advising, and more students.

- Aspiration statement needs to be broadened to include students
- Questions
 - What is the policy?
 - Infrastructure needs
 - Policy, procedure
 - Development and support team (CTL)
 - Faculty lead course management
 - Enrollment, aid support
 - Consistency in expectations
 - Strategic approach
 - Budget priority (investment)
- CTL, EM, academic advisors, provost office
 - Need to recruit EM, advisors, provost office representation

Insights

- Efficiency and uniformity gains in large enrollment courses
 - General education courses at least
- Enrollment and retention gains likely
- Impacts traditional and non-traditional students
- Online helps raise caps
- Quality is not just class size, access component for students
- Investment up front creates savings later

Needs

Directive from top, cost up front will lead to efficiencies and savings (enrollment and retention gains)

Coordinators – Seth and Todd Pavlack

Research

Group felt that the aspiration statement was too generic and could apply to any university. They want to rewrite it to focus on the broad range of research across the university that is unique to WSU and includes students' participation in the research process. Additional perspectives needed: more faculty from across colleges.

Stewardship

Slightly reworked statement to remove the last clause (we cannot control others' perceptions). They felt that this statement has existed in previous strategic plans and questioned the follow through on the actual statement. What does accountability look like? Are there consequences? Need more people.

Aspiration statement reaction

- Like
 - Student success
 - Priorities
 - Create culture of assessment
 - Sustainability
- Revise statement to -> Our resources are strategically aligned to encourage innovation and student success through world class interdisciplinary education and research.
- It is a compelling statement

Next steps

- Who will serve on the cross sectional committee?
- How will membership be defined?
- Key question – What does accountability look like?
 - Need a process for holding individuals accountable
 - Set transparency standards that are informed by (not necessarily based on) data

Coordinator Ron Heyart

Student Academic Support

- Review of Aspiration Statement: Determined that statement was OK with a slight wording change to read: *Wright State will have an integrated care model of academic and student support to increase persistence toward academic goal completion.*
- Discussion of who else should be in the room. Determined that our team should have representation or at a minimum feedback from the following that are not currently a part of our team:
 - Seeking more diversity
 - Students
 - Residence Life and Housing Staff
 - Family Members
 - Admissions or Raider Connect Staff
 - Faculty
 - High School Principals
 - Career Center
- Questions asked that are most relevant to our work:
 - How can we as a university be more proactive in determining if a student might need additional services? Had a discussion of how a review of data about an incoming student might trigger a next level of support
 - What is the definition of “customized care”? This led to the slight change in our aspiration statement to “integrated care” to indicate that the entire WSU faculty and staff play a role in this indicator of success.
 - What role would faculty play in early alert?
 - Could this method of academic support also be applied in a way that would result in better retention of CCP students?
 - How do we make sure that this model that we create is inclusive of all of our learners, first year direct from HS, transfer, and non-traditional students.
 - What are the critical factors to focus on in creating our indicators of success?
 - What are all the areas of student contact? From initial mailings, staff, student organizations, faculty, advisors, etc.
 - What do our students need? How do we show a more ‘customer service philosophy’?
 - What NEW is needed?
 - What are the best practices within WSU right now in this area? What are best practices of other universities?
 - In the end – what would success look like? How would we measure? Talked a little about what is already being tracked through IR, including retention data, SSI, and NSSE.
- Selected Co-coordinators for our group: David Bringhurst and Gina Keucher

Student Life

In the aspiration statement, removed “world class” and replaced it with “high quality.” Thought “high quality” was more of an achievable goal. Need to find out what students want, what different student groups want (nontraditional, commuters, etc.). Need alumni, faculty, and facilities management.

Tangent talk:

The group got on some tangents of who are we serving, how do we connect with those students who we aren’t currently serving.

Point was also brought up that there is a lot to do here (on weekends) but you just have to get involved and look for it. A new housing hall would have more common spaces so people can see what’s going on. A new recreation center would be open and visible unlike the current situations. Classroom spaces need to have more open student areas.

The group discussed how orientations at another university (Miami, OH) does 2 days and that may be necessary to get all the right information out to students and families. It was also discussed in past (not sure if this still holds true) but parents and students go separate paths during orientation and the information doesn’t get to everyone. Some parents are disengaged or not present.

The group discussed frustration with the “new” mission statement and how if this is the path WSU wants to go, how much will need to be changed about who we recruit, admit and serve. We are far from a research institution and to get on that level our admit scores will need to be much higher in our opinion. The group really disliked it.

How students here feel the need to work 40+ hour jobs and this is the culture of WSU and not sure it’s necessary. How do we better educate students on finances, what it means to have a refund in Fall and how they will need that money in Spring too. Also when they graduate what (approx.) will their repayment of the loans look like.

Questions relevant to the work required:

1. What do the students want
2. How do we engage with the students we are missing
3. Is a student fee a viable option

Need to be involved:

Administration – Can assist with the Needs, Wants and Dreams

Alumni – what they enjoyed about their UG experience and what they wish they had

Athletics – They are a big part of student life

Enrollment Management – what will the class of 2025 look like? What’s the demographics of the Region, Ohio, Midwest and Nation. *2025 will be ~18 years from the 2008 recession, families weren’t having children as jobs went away, is that a noticeable decrease in the student population?

Faculty – need the buy in of educating the whole student, and student life is a big part of that experiential learning.

Identity Centers – example of additional student life areas

Planning & Engineering – goals of new facilities and facility changes

Students – more students of different WSU commitment levels (Currently have 3 students which are involved in the following areas–SGA, Res Life, Recreation, student orgs., and other jobs on campus)

Student Affairs Departments – need more representation

Coordinators: Dr. Chris Taylor – Student Conduct and Billy Willis – Campus Recreation

Technology, Entrepreneurship & Innovation

The group felt that innovation and entrepreneurship were more cultural elements – not equivalent to teaching but something that could be incorporated into teaching. The group wanted to include staff, students, community, and industrial partners. They want to know what these terms specifically mean to those who wrote it and to the university.

David discussed the homework tasks needed: revise the aspirational statement to describe the ideal future of what each group would like to see in their area. Groups are encouraged to work with Advancement, Career Center, and Deans' offices to coordinate outreach to the community for additional perspectives. David and President Schrader provide guidelines on working on strategy statements.

Common theme for the discussion of the “big strategic idea”: Focus on student-centered, self-identified goals and help them to reach those goals through experiential/service learning. Work on resources to help students achieve their goals, including uniting the campus through the Wright State experience and working with students to remove barriers, such as creating more courses available in different modes or times. Student retention may be improved by reaching out to k-12 and helping students early on so that we become their university of choice.

Reactions to aspiration statement

- Statement needs modification
- Innovation and entrepreneurship are cultural elements to be encouraged
 - “on par” is not right, presupposes triangular equality – maybe state “in support of”
- Statement needs to clarify that should not be faculty only, but staff and students
- Technology is just one of many tools
- No “technology trap” of widgets for widgets sake (of impact)
- Why “on par” there – to get past complacency, staid, no changes
- Should emphasize impact is internal as well as external
- Innovation, tech, & entrepreneurship should necessarily be involved and inspired by the values (that shape our mission) (in service to the mission, as one of the value)

Key questions

- Entrepreneurship is starting a business – is that what we are doing? Is that what got us in trouble?
- Is our goal to make more businesses? (profit or nonprofit)

- Is actually our emphasis innovation first and foremost?

Who needs to be involved:

- Original people – what was their intent, where did tech come in group – digital transformation of services
- Staff & students, so we can understand how these are broader ideas than science research (or perceived of as that)
- Community & industry partners (needs and dreams)
 - And a culture of thinking about asking these groups